

Remarks

In response to the Office Action mailed April 19, 2006, the Applicants respectfully request reconsideration in view of the following remarks. In the present application, claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 20, 22, 32, 34, and 41 have been canceled and claims 1, 6, 8, 10, 15, 17, 19, 24, 26, 31, 36, 37, and 40 have been amended. The claims have been amended to incorporate features specified in the canceled claims, to clarify that the request for data manipulation includes the data to be manipulated, that the data includes long distance ordering information including at least one of valid installation dates, available installation dates, and an allowable number of telephones, and that the table-based system of rules are organized into at least three hierarchically organized views, wherein a least amount of the data is sorted by a first view and wherein most of the data is handled by a third view, thereby improving efficiency in performing manipulation functions. Support for these amendments may be found in paragraphs 0010, 0014, 0020, and 0028 in the Specification. No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirkwood et al. (US 6665662, hereinafter “Kirkwood”) in view of Adamchick (US 5761668). Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 27-30, 33, 35, and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kirkwood in view of Adamchick and Official Notice.

Applicant’s Statement of the Substance of the Interview

A telephonic interview between the undersigned representative for the Applicants and the Examiner was held on June 13, 2006 to discuss the rejection of the claims in view of the cited reference Kirkwood. In particular, it was argued that Kirkwood failed to

disclose the manipulation of data where the data to be manipulated is received in a manipulation request. The Examiner agreed but noted that the claims as presently constituted did not disclose this feature. Applicants' representative proposed to amend the claims to clarify this feature and distinguish the reference.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103

In the Office Action, claims 1-2, 4, 6, 8, 10-11, 13, 15, 17, 19, 22, 24-26, 28-32, 34, 36-38, and 40-41 are rejected as being unpatentable over Kirkwood in view of Adamchick. Claims 2, 4, 11, 13, 22, 32, 34, and 41 have been canceled. The rejection of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

Amended independent claim 1 specifies a client-server computer system which includes at least one client application server that utilizes data in a form other than an initial form and generates a manipulation request for manipulation of the data from the initial form wherein the request includes the data to be manipulated in the initial form, and wherein the data to be manipulated comprises long distance ordering information including at least one of valid installation dates, available installation dates, and an allowable number of telephones; an application server accessible by a plurality of client application servers via a plurality of application software protocols, wherein said application server provides a data manipulation service on the data received from the client application server in response to receiving the manipulation request from the client application server, wherein the data manipulation service causes a change to the data to the form other than the initial form and returns the changed data to the same client application server that requested the manipulation, and wherein the data manipulation includes changing characters of a portion of the data from one case to another case and

changing a date within a portion of the data from a year representation of a first set of digits to a year representation of a second set of digits; and a storage mass coupled to said application server for storing a system of dynamically maintainable manipulation functions for performing said manipulation service, wherein said storage mass comprises a database, wherein said database contains a table-based system of rules organized into at least three hierarchically organized views, and wherein a least amount of the data is sorted by a first view and wherein most of the data is handled by a third view, thereby improving efficiency in performing the manipulation functions.

It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kirkwood and Adamchick fails to teach, disclose, or suggest each of the features specified in amended independent claim 1. For example, the aforementioned references fail to disclose a data manipulation request where the request includes the data to be manipulated. As discussed in Applicants' previous response, Kirkwood teaches that the data requested by a query is gathered and manipulated by an application server according to a markup language query and the result is returned to the client where the client translates the information from the markup language and extracts the data queried for (col. 3, lines 5-15 and col. 21, line 50-65). Thus, the query sent by the client in Kirkwood does not include the data to be manipulated but is rather a request for data to be obtained, which is contrary to amended claim 1. Adamchick, as also discussed in Applicants' previous response, is merely concerned with calendar date conversions and thus also fails to cure the deficiencies of Kirkwood. Moreover, amended claim 1 is also allowable over additional features specified therein including data which includes long distance ordering information including at least one of valid installation dates, available installation dates, and an

allowable number of telephones, and that the table-based system of rules are organized into at least three hierarchically organized views, wherein a least amount of the data is sorted by a first view and wherein most of the data is handled by a third view, thereby improving efficiency in performing manipulation functions. It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Kirkwood and Adamchick also fail to disclose these features. For example, Kirkwood is merely concerned with vocabulary data and also fails to disclose at least three hierarchical organized views wherein the amount of data sorted and manipulated is dependent on the type of view.

Based on the foregoing, amended independent claim 1 is allowable and the rejection of this claim should be withdrawn. Independent claims 10, 19, 31, 36, 37, and 40 are similar to amended claim 1 and recite at least the same features. Therefore, these claims are allowable for at least the same reasons and the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn. Claims 6, 8, 15, 17, 24-26, 28-30, and 38 depend from claims 1, 10, 19, and 37 and are thus allowable for at least the same reasons. Therefore the rejection of these claims should also be withdrawn.

Claims 3, 5, 7, 9, 12, 14, 16, 18, 21, 23, 27-30, 33, 35, and 39 are rejected under as being unpatentable over Kirkwood in view of Adamchick and Official Notice. Each of these claims depend from an allowable independent claims and thus are allowable over the combination of Kirkwood and Adamchick for at least the same reasons. The Examiner's Official Notice merely concerns the use of LDAP and thus does not cure the deficiencies, discussed above, of the aforementioned references in view of the amended claims. Therefore, these dependent claims are allowable for at least the same reasons as

the independent claims from which they depend. Accordingly, the rejection of these dependent claims should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, this application is now in condition for allowance. A notice to this effect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this amendment, that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to call the Applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 30, 2006

/Alton Hornsby III/
Alton Hornsby III, Reg. #47299

Withers & Keys, LLC
P.O. Box 71355
Marietta, GA 30007-1355
(404) 849-2093